

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges with thanks examiner's indication that claims 4, 5, 7, 15 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

The examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6, 9-14, 16 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by PA-RISC 2.0 Architecture to Kane.

Applicant amended independent claim 1 to include a feature similar to the feature recited in allowable claim 4, namely that the branch instruction includes a token that specifies a number *i* of instructions to execute following the branch instruction before performing the branch operation. Applicant similarly amended independent claims 11 and 21, directed to a method and processor, respectively, to include similar features to those added to claim 1. Additionally, applicant cancelled claims 4 and 15, and amended claim 5 to make the language recited therein consistent with the amended language of independent claim 1.

Accordingly, with the above-indicated amendment to independent claims 1, 11 and 21, applicant considers independent claims 1, 11 and 21, and the respective claims depending from them, to be patentable over the cited art.

Further, applicant added new independent claim 26 reciting features similar to those recited in old claim 1 and in claim 7. As noted above, the examiner indicated that the feature of claim 7, namely, that "the branch instruction comprises a token that is set by a programmer and which specifies a guess_branch prefetch for the instruction for the "branch taken" condition rather than the next sequential instruction" would be allowable if included with the feature of the claims it depends from. Applicant also added new claims 27-30 reciting features similar to the features recited respectively in claims 2-3 and 9-10. Applicant cancelled claim 7.

Applicant thus considers new claims 26-30 to be patentable over the cited art.

In addition, applicant added new independent claim 31 reciting features similar to those recited in independent claim 11 and claim 17. As noted above, the examiner indicated that the feature of claim 17, namely, that the method includes "prefetching a "branch taken" instruction based on a token that is set by a programmer, and which specifies a guess_branch prefetch for

the instruction for the "branch taken" condition rather than the next sequential instruction" would be allowable if included with the features of the claims it depends from. Applicant also added new claims 32-35 reciting features similar to the features recited respectively in claims 12-14 and 20. Applicant cancelled claim 17.

Applicant thus considers claims 31-35 to be patentable over the cited art.

Applicant also added new independent processor claim 36, reciting features similar to those recited in claim 21 and 17. Applicant also added new claim 37 reciting feature similar to those recited in claim 33.

Applicant thus considers claims 36-37 to be patentable over the cited art.

It is believed that all the rejections and/or objections raised by the examiner have been addressed.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the examiner's earliest convenience.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Gilbert Wolrich et al.
Serial No. : 10/069,195
Filed : November 7, 2002
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-304US1 / P9625US

The fee in the total amount of \$900.00 for excess claims is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply all charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 06-1050.

Date:

Aug 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Ido Rabinovitch
Attorney for Intel Corporation
Reg. No. L0080

PTO Customer No. 20985
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906